

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JOHN JAMES SAKOCIUS,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	No. 1:21-cv-640
v.	)	
	)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
MODERNA, INC. ET AL.,	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT & RECOMMENDATION**

This matter was referred to the Honorable Sally J. Berens, United States Magistrate Judge, who issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) on August 4, 2021 (ECF No. 4). The R&R recommends that the Court *sua sponte* dismiss this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction due to the totally implausible, unsubstantial, frivolous, and devoid of merit claims that the complaint raises. Plaintiff was then given fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendation per 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). Plaintiff subsequently filed three documents in response to the R&R, but none of the documents assert a cognizable objection to the R&R (ECF Nos. 5, 6, 8).

After being served with an R&R issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews *de novo* the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a *de novo* review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (*per curiam*).

On review of the evidence, the Court agrees with the magistrate judge. Plaintiff's complaint and three subsequent documents in response to the magistrate's R&R fail to assert any coherent claim, argument, or objection (ECF Nos. 5, 6, 8). Plaintiff was required to make *specific* objections to the R&R but failed to do so. Instead, Plaintiff's incoherent documents are difficult to follow while discussing ideas such as "Hetapod Language Math" (ECF No. 5 at PageID.20), "Mars Orbital Bodies" (ECF No. 5 at PageID.22), a request that Congressman Peter Meijer issue Plaintiff a check for \$1,437,280 (ECF No. 5 at PageID.23), "Franklin Delanor Roosevelt v Winston Churchill" (ECF No. 6 at PageID.25), the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (ECF No. 8 at PageID.33), and "evidence" of a check written to himself in the amount of \$4,470,240 (ECF No. 8-1 at PageID.72).

Given that there are no errors in the magistrate judge's analysis and the Court was unable to ascertain any objections in Plaintiff's documents, the Court accepts the magistrate's recommendation to dismiss this case *sua sponte*. Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT** the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 4) as the Opinion of the Court.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**Date:** September 2, 2021

/s/ Paul L. Maloney  
Paul L. Maloney  
United States District Judge